Cas	se 3:07-cv-00187-MEF-TFM	Document 1	Filed 02/06/2007	Page 1 of 6			
, 9	age;3:17-cv-00219-RGJ-KLH	Document 1-1	Filed 02/06/2007	Page 1 of 6			
CEN DIST	RICT COURT RICT OF LOUISIANA CEIVED						
,,,,							
	0 6 2007 CLERK UI		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
ROBERT H.			DISTRICT COURT STRICT OF LOUISIAN	JA			
	PORTI	WESTERN	DIVISION	1			
	MARIO JIMINEZ D.O.C.	AL 200571	3:M-W-187-MF				
	Petitioner's Name and Numb		3:07cv0219	SEC P			
			JUDGE JAN	MES			
			MAG. JUDG	E HAYES			
	VS.						
•	HARVEY GRIMMER, W	AKDEN	Magistrate Judge				
	WEST CARROLL DETENTI	<u>ON</u> CENTER					
	Name of Respondent						
	APPLICATIO		WRIT OF HABEAS C	CORPUS			
	Present place of confinement	UNDER 28 U		EPPS, LATING			
•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			·			
•	2. Indicate the basis for your pe	tition and complete t	he portions of the applicat	ion form indicated:			
	a. <u>UES</u> A convi						
		_		te imposed under a federal U.S.C.§2255 in the federal			
	2 0	nich entered the judg		.s.c.y2255 iii tiio lottolul			
	1/0	iscipline.					
		e problem. her placed by the Sta	te of	•			
			iner placed by the Immig	gration & Naturalization			
	Service.		ustody of the Immigration	& Naturalization Service.			
	h. <u>UES</u> Other	STATE OF ALA	RAMA CONVICTION	1 SENTENCE			
• •	3. PERSONS CHALLENGI	NG A FEDERAL	CONVICTION OR SE	NTENCE COMPLETE			
	THIS PART.						
•				ction and the sentence you			
			urrently under attack. LEE	<u>COUNTY CIRCUIT</u> EE COUNTY ALABAMA			
	-			EE COONIA MORRIMA			
	b. Date of judgmen	nt of conviction. <u>NC</u>	N 8TH 2005				
			•				

Document 1-1

Filed 02/06/2007

Page 2 of 6

c.	Length of sentence imposed. 30 4RS
đ.	Name of sentencing judge. TACOBS A. WALKER III
e.	Nature of the offense(s) for which you were convicted (list all counts). RAPE IST DEGREE 13A-GG ALABAMA CODE 1975"
f.	What was your plea? Guilty
	Nolo Contendere Nolo Contendere
	If you entered a GUILTY plea to one count or indictment and a NOT GUILTY plea to another count or indictment, give details.
g.	Type of trial. <u>YES</u> Jury Judge Only
h.	Did you testify at trial?
	UES Yes No
i.	Did you appeal from the judgment of conviction? <u>UES</u> Yes No
j.	If you did appeal, answer the following: 1. Name of court. ALABAMA CRIMINAL COURT OF APPEALS 2. Result of appeal. DENIED
	3. Date of result. NOVEMBER 17TH 2006
	4. Grounds raised on appeal TRIAL COURT ERRED BY ALLOWING INADMISSABLE TESTIMONY TRIAL COURT ERRED IN ALLOWING OPINION OF BRENDA MOSS TRIAL COURT ERRED IN ALLOWING EVIDENCE OF COLLATERAL SEXUAL MISCONDUCT WITH THE ALLEDGED VICTIM.
k.	Other than a direct appeal from the judgment of conviction and sentence, have you filed any other petitions, applications or motions with respect to this judgment in any court, state or federal?

Document 1-1

Filed 02/06/2007

Page 3 of 6

** **	ES, give the following information:	
1.	Name of court. N/A	
2.	Nature of proceeding. NIA	<u></u>
3.	Grounds raised. NA	
	(i) Did you receive an evidentiary hearing on the petition, application	on, or
	motion?	
	Yes	
	NO No	
	(ii) If YES, give the following information:	
	Result. NA	
	Du Carlo Malo	-
TT.	Date of result. N A	— -do to
	we you filed a motion under Section 2255 of Title 28 of the United States Co	ode to
vaca	ate, set aside, or correct the sentence imposed? Yes	
- N		
	YES, what grounds were presented? NA	
11 1.	123, what grounds were presented: 447	
Do y	you have any petition, application, or appeal pending in any court, state or fed	eral?
Doy	you have any petition, application, or appeal pending in any court, state or fed	eral?
	The state of the s	eral?
	Yes O No /ES, give the following information:	eral?
	Yes No	eral?
N If Y	Yes O No /ES, give the following information:	eral?
N If Y 1. 2.	Yes O No /ES, give the following information: Name of court. No A Nature of proceeding. No A	eral?
N If YI 1. 2.	Yes No No PES, give the following information: Name of court. Nature of proceeding. Date of filing.	eral?
N If YI 1. 2. 3. 4.	Yes No No No No Name of court. Name of proceeding. Nature of filing. Name of filing. Name of filing. Nature of proceeding.	eral?
N If YI 1. 2.	Yes No No PES, give the following information: Name of court. Nature of proceeding. Date of filing.	eral?
N If Y 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.	Yes No	
N If YI 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.	Yes No	
N If YI 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.	Yes No	
N If Y 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. Have indice	Yes No	

20

judgment under attack in this petition? Yes No

Document 1-1

Filed 02/06/2007

Page 4 of 6

decision to the National Appeals Board or any other available agency for review? Yes No If YES, what was the result?
2. Length of sentence to be served in the future. NA 3. Have you filed or do you contemplate filing any petition attacking the judgment which imposed the future sentence. Yes NO No 4. PERSONS CHALLENGINGA DECISION BYTHE PAROLE COMMISSION COMPLETE THIS PART. a. Have you presented this claim or any other claim challenging the Parole Commission's decision to the National Appeals Board or any other available agency for review? Yes No If YES, what was the result?
3. Have you filed or do you contemplate filing any petition attacking the judgment which imposed the future sentence. Yes No No 4. PERSONS CHALLENGINGA DECISION BYTHE PAROLE COMMISSION COMPLETE THIS PART. a. Have you presented this claim or any other claim challenging the Parole Commission's decision to the National Appeals Board or any other available agency for review? Yes No If YES, what was the result?
3. Have you filed or do you contemplate filing any petition attacking the judgment which imposed the future sentence. Yes No No 4. PERSONS CHALLENGINGA DECISION BYTHE PAROLE COMMISSION COMPLETE THIS PART. a. Have you presented this claim or any other claim challenging the Parole Commission's decision to the National Appeals Board or any other available agency for review? Yes No If YES, what was the result?
which imposed the future sentence. Yes No No 4. PERSONS CHALLENGINGA DECISION BYTHE PAROLE COMMISSION COMPLETE THIS PART. a. Have you presented this claim or any other claim challenging the Parole Commission's decision to the National Appeals Board or any other available agency for review? Yes No If YES, what was the result?
Yes No No 4. PERSONS CHALLENGING A DECISION BYTHE PAROLE COMMISSION COMPLETE THIS PART. a. Have you presented this claim or any other claim challenging the Parole Commission's decision to the National Appeals Board or any other available agency for review? Yes No If YES, what was the result?
4. PERSONS CHALLENGINGA DECISION BYTHE PAROLE COMMISSION COMPLETE THIS PART. a. Have you presented this claim or any other claim challenging the Parole Commission's decision to the National Appeals Board or any other available agency for review? Yes No If YES, what was the result?
4. PERSONS CHALLENGING A DECISION BYTHE PAROLE COMMISSION COMPLETE THIS PART. a. Have you presented this claim or any other claim challenging the Parole Commission's decision to the National Appeals Board or any other available agency for review? Yes No If YES, what was the result?
a. Have you presented this claim or any other claim challenging the Parole Commission's decision to the National Appeals Board or any other available agency for review? Yes No If YES, what was the result?
a. Have you presented this claim or any other claim challenging the Parole Commission's decision to the National Appeals Board or any other available agency for review? Yes No If YES, what was the result?
decision to the National Appeals Board or any other available agency for review? Yes No If YES, what was the result?
decision to the National Appeals Board or any other available agency for review? Yes No If YES, what was the result?
Yes No If YES, what was the result?
No If YES, what was the result?
If YES, what was the result?
5. PERSONS CHALLENGING A STATE DETAINER COMPLETE THIS PART.
a. Have you presented this claim or any other claim concerning the legality of the state
detainer placed against you to that state's highest court? (NOTE: Interstate Agreement
on Detainers)
\overline{IVH} No
7
6.PERSONSCHALLENGINGACTIONSBY THEIMMIGRATION&NATURALIZATION
SERVICE COMPLETE THIS PART.
a. Have you presented this claim or any other claim concerning the INS's action to the Board
of Immigration Appeal?
Yes
No
If YES, what was the date and result of the appeal?
7. THIS SECTION IS TO BE COMPLETED BY ALL PETITIONERS.
Specifics of your claim. State concisely and clearly every ground on which you claim that you are
being held unlawfully. Summarize briefly the facts supporting each ground. Do not cite case law.

Document 1-1

Filed 02/06/2007

Page 5 of 6

Give only factual information.

GROUND ONE WEIGHT OF THE EVIDENCE DOES NOT SUPPORT CONSTITUTIONAL CONVICTION. CONVICTION OBTAINED SOELY BY CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE. SUPPORTING FACTS PERJERED TESTIMONY BY MS. STOZIER UNQUALIFIED FORENSIC EXAMINER BRENDA MOSS TAINTED JURY HEARING COLLATERAL EVIDENCE OF MISCOUDUCT. GROUND TWO TRIAL COURT TUDGE GAVE FAULTY JURY INSTRUCTIONS, ALSO TRIAL COURT WAS BIAS, RESULTING IN PREJUDICE, BY FAILING TO GRANT OR SUSTAIN ANY OBJECTIONS OR MOTIONS BU THE DEFENSE COUNSEL. SUPPORTING FACTS TRIAL COURT JUDGE DENIED 9 OUT OF IL OBJECTIONS MADE DURING TRIAL BY DEFENSE COUNSEL, ALSO FAILED TO GIVE ACCURATE JURY INSTRUCTIONS DEFINEING SEXUAL ABUSE OR ELEMENTS OF RAPE IST DEGREE

GROUND THREE ABUSE OF DISCRECTION BY TRIAL COURT TUDGE IN IMPROPER INSTRUCTIONS REGUARDING BEYOND A"REASONABLE DOUBT" AND TO A "MORAL CERTAINTY" WHICH WAS CONFUSING AND PLACING UNDUE PRESSURE ON THE JUROPS SUPPORTING FACTS JUDGE CONFUSED THE JURORS BY FORCING CONVICTION WHEN TESTIMONY AND INVESTIGATION WAS FOR SEXUAL ABUSE, WHILE INDICTMENT STATED RAPE IS DEGREE, JURORS COULD NOT ASCERTAIN DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ELEMENTS OF RAPE OR SEXUAL ABUSE, "WITHOUT DOURT" GROUND FOUR INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL, COUNSEL FAILED TO BRING FORTH WITNESSES OF BOTH PROFFESIONAL OR EXPERT, OR PERSONAL STATUS REGAURDLESS OF MY REPEATED DIRECTIVES TO DO SO. SUPPORTING FACTS COUNSEL WAS DIRECTED TO SECURE BOTH MEDICAL AND FORENSICS EXPERTS FOR DEFENSE, BUT FAILED TO DO SO. ALSO WAS INSTRUCTED TO SECURE HANDWRITEN REPORT, TAPES OR OTHERWISE INTERVIEWS WITH ALLEDGED VICTIM BY BRENDA MOSS, Buttailed,

Signature of Petitioner

Document 1-1

Filed 02/06/2007

Page 6 of 6 X

5775, ha. 7123,













Clerk of United States District (Western District of Lausiana, 300 Famin Street, Suite 1167 Shreve port, Louisiana, 91101-205 The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·								****
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANT						
Mario Jiminez # 244571				Harvey Grimmer						
(b) County of Decidence	eriou I into I Plainties	V. Carrol	1	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant						
(b) County of Residence of	OF PIPST LISTED PLAINTIFF CAS		'	County of Resident	ice of i		LAINTIFF CASES	ONLY		
(L7	CELLING O.O. TEMEVINI CAN	,,,,,		NOTE: IN L	LAND (•	IATION CASES, U	•	ION OF TE	ŧΕ
1.5 4.	11 2 101	_		!		VOLVED.				
W. Carro	11 Det. Ctr	• _		A thomas is (TST)						
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, 180 Cap	address, and Telephone Number) Dr.		Attorneys (If Know	vny					
F.00 Cup.	1 $M $ $1 $ $1 $ $2 $ 1									
II. BASIS OF JURISD	CTION (Place an "X" in	One Box Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF	F PR	INCIPA	AL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in	One Box fo	r Plaintiff
1 U.S. Government	3 Federal Question			(For Diversity Cases Onl	ıly) PTF	DEF		and One Box	for Defenda	nt) DEF
U.S. Government Plaintiff	(U.S. Government)	Not a Party)	Citize	en of This State	01		Incorporated or P of Business In Th		O 4	□ 4
2 U.S. Government	4 Diversity		Citize	en of Another State	D 2	D 2	Incorporated and	Principal Place	O 5	D 5
Defendant	-	p of Parties in Item III)					of Business In			
	(,,	Citize	en or Subject of a	D 3	D 3	Foreign Nation		D 6	C7 6
	·		Fo	reign Country						
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box Onl		FOR	FEITURE/PENALTY	n na niga	TO BAN	KRUPTCY	OTHER	STATUT	ES
110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJUR		10 Agriculture			al 28 USC 158	☐ 400 State R		
120 Marine	☐ 310 Airplane	362 Personal Injury -	. D 6	20 Other Food & Drug	C	J 423 With	drawal	🗇 410 Antitru	ıst	
☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	315 Airplane Product Liability	Med. Malpractice 365 Personal Injury -		25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 88		28 US	SC 157	☐ 430 Banks ☐ 450 Comm		g
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	320 Assault, Libel &	Product Liability		30 Liquor Laws	°°'	PROPE	RTY RIGHTS	460 Deport		
& Enforcement of Judgment	Slander	368 Asbestos Persona		40 R.R. & Truck		3 820 Copy	rights	☐ 470 Racket	eer Influen	
☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	330 Federal Employers' Liability	Injury Product Liability		50 Airline Regs. 60 Occupational		J 830 Pater J 840 Trad		Corrupt 480 Consur	Organizati	ons
Student Loans	☐ 340 Marine	PERSONAL PROPER		Safety/Health		J 040 11au	CHIAIR	1 490 Cable/		
(Excl. Veterans)	☐ 345 Marine Product	370 Other Fraud	□ 6	90 Other				☐ 810 Selecti	ve Service	
153 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability 350 Motor Vehicle	371 Truth in Lending		LABOR 10 Fair Labor Standards			SECURITY	☐ 850 Securit		dities/
of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits	350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle	380 Other Personal Property Damage	/ ا	Act		J 861 HIA J 862 Blaci	(1395H) k Lung (923)	Exchan 875 Custon		ge
190 Other Contract	Product Liability	385 Property Damage		20 Labor/Mgmt. Relation	ons [J 863 DIW	C/DIWW (405(g))	12 USC	3410	· .
☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise	360 Other Personal Injury	Product Liability	0 7	30 Labor/Mgmt.Reportin & Disclosure Act		3 864 SSID		☐ 890 Other 9		ctions
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITION	NS O 7	40 Railway Labor Act	-	J 865 RSI (FEDERA	L TAX SUITS	S92 Econor		ation Act
210 Land Condemnation	441 Voting	510 Motions to Vacat	e 🔲 7	90 Other Labor Litigation	on [s (U.S. Plaintiff	Senviro		
220 Foreclosure	442 Employment	Sentence	0.7	91 Empl. Ret. Inc.	۔ ا		fendant)	☐ 894 Energy		
230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land	443 Housing/ Accommodations	Habeas Corpus: 530 General	1	Security Act	-		-Third Party	895 Freedo	m of Inform	nation
245 Tort Product Liability	444 Welfare	535 Death Penalty	- 1			26 USC 7609		☐ 900Appeal	of Fee Dete	rmination
290 All Other Real Property	445 Amer. w/Disabilities -	540 Mandamus & Otl	ner		ŀ				Equal Acces	is
	Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	☐ 550 Civil Rights ☐ 555 Prison Condition	- 1		ŀ			to Justic		.r
	Other	333 Frison Condition						950 Constit		ı
	440 Other Civil Rights							<u> </u>		
V ORIGIN (Place	an "X" in One Box Only)								Appeal to	District
No.	Π́ 2	Remanded from	1 4 pain			red from district	□ 6 Multidist	– 7	Judge from	n
	ate Court	Appellate Court	Reor	pened (sp	pecify))	Litigation	nct .	Magistrate Judgment	
	Cite the U.S. Civil Sta	tute under which you a	re filing (Do not cite jurisdicti	tional :	statutes u	nless diversity):			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	DN Brief description of ca	use: 28:6	124	1						
VII. REQUESTED IN	CHECK IF THIS	IS A CLASS ACTION		EMAND \$		C	HECK YES only	if demanded in	complair	nt.
COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.C.P.		•	-6	十		URY DEMAND		No No	
VIII. RELATED CASI	(2)5									
IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE				DOCKE	T NUMBER			
DATE		SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY	OF RECORD						
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY										
RECEIPT # A	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	E		MAG. JUI	DGE		

Case 3:07-cv-00219-RGJ-KLH Document 1-3 Filed 02/06/2007 Page 1 of Triginal #/

ULS, DISTRICT COURT • WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA RECEIVED

FEB 0 6 2007 THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT
RT H. SAMWELL, CLERK
OF LOUISIANA

ROBERT H. SAYMWELL, CLERK

OF LOCISIAN

MARIO JIMINEZ #244571

PETITIONER,

VS.

3:07cv0219 SEC P JUDGE JAMES MAG. JUDGE HAYES

HARVEY GRIMMER, WARDEN, W.C.D.C.

RESPONDENTS,

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF, MOTION TO VACATE CONVICTION AND SENTENCE, PURSUANT, 28 U.S.C. 2241-2254

COMES NOW THE PETITIONER, MARIO JIMINEZ PRO-SE, IN THE ABOVE STYLED CAUSE OF ACTION. THE PETITIONER IS BEING HELD BY INCARCERATION FOR AN OFFENSE HE DID NOT COMMIT. THE PETITIONER IS INCARCERATED ILLEGALLY AND IS ACTUALLY INNOCENT OF ANY CRIME ALLEGED BY THE INDICTMENT. THE FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS RULES OF OUR COURT SYSTEMS, IN THE STATE OF ALABAMA, HAVE BEEN PREJUDICED BY THE NATURE OF THE ALLEGED OFFENSE, THEREBY, THE MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE OF A TRULY EXTRAORDINARY CASE IS BEFORE THIS MOST HONORABLE DISTRICT COURT.

FACTS AS FOLLOWS:

- a) THE PETITIONER WAS ARRESTED FOR AN OFFENSE WITHOUT POLICE EVER HAVING INVESTIGATED THE CASE OR QUESTIONING THIS PETITIONER AT ANY TIME.
- b) THE PETITIONER WAS INDICTED BY THE GRAND JURY BY WAY OF PERJURED TESTIMONY.
- c) THE PETITIONER WAS REPRESENTED BY UNPROFESSIONAL STANDARDS OF COUNSEL, TO THE DEGREE OF UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTIONS, PERMITTING CONVICTION BY REFUSING TO SECURE NECESSARY EXPERT WITNESSES OR DILIGENTLY ARGUE OBJECTIONS.

- d) PETITIONER WAS VICTIM OF A BIASED AND PREJUDICED COURT, ALSO, DENIED A FAIR AND IMPARTIAL TRIAL.
- e) PETITIONER WAS SUBJECT TO INADMISSIBLE EVIDENCE ADMITTED BY THE TRIAL COURT JUDGE AND TESTIMONY MANUFACTURED BY AN UNLICENSED, UNQUALIFIED INDIVIDUAL WITH A SECRET REPORT OF PERSONAL NOTES. (NEVER VIEWED BY COURT OR DEFENSE COUNSEL, ABSENT ANT VIDEO OR AUDIO TAPES OF ALLEGED INTERVIEWS WITH THE SO-CALLED VICTIM.) UNCONSTITUTIONAL EVIDENCE OF CIRCUMSTANCES.

TRUE FACTS OF THE CASE- IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO VACATE, 28U.S.C. 2241-2254

f) THE PETITIONER WAS SUBJECTED TO A TRIAL COURT THAT WAS PREJUDICED BY THE ACT OF FAULTY JURY INSTRUCTIONS GIVEN BY THE JUDGE, TO FIND HIM GUILTY BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT, AND TO A MORAL CERTAINTY. THE PHRASE MORAL CERTAINTY SHOCKED THE JURORS AND THE RESULTS OF WHICH REGISTERED ON THEIR FACES.

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT UNDER 28-1(i)

YOUR HONOR, THE ALABAMA STATE COURT ADJUDICATION IS **CONTRARY TO** CLEARLY ESTABLISHED FEDERAL LAW, AND U.S. SUPREME COURT PRECEDENTS.

THE OFFENSE OF RAPE IN ANY CAPACITY IS VIEWED BY CITIZENS AND COURTS AS ONE OF THE WORST OFFENSES. THE SUBJECT MATTER IS SEVERELY AGGRAVATED BY POLITICIANS SEEKING APPROVAL BY PUBLIC VOTERS FOR PERSONAL AND POLITICAL GAIN. IN ALABAMA THE SUBJECT OF SEX CRIMES IS THE MOST POPULAR MODE OF POLITICAL CAMPAIGNING AND PUBLICITY STUMPING. ONE ONLY HAS TO READ A NEWSPAPER OR WATCH TV IN ALABAMA TO KNOW THESE FACTS ARE TRUE AND CORRECT. ALABAMA TOUTS THE MOST HARSH AND SEVERE PUNISHMENTS FOR THESE OFFENSES. THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, TROY KING, HAS REPEATEDLY BEEN IN THE LIME LIGHT ON TV DEMANDING THE LEGISLATURE TO PASS HIS NEW LAWS AND AMENDMENTS TO LAWS THAT ARE PREJUDICED AND BIASED BY THE U.S. CONSTITUTION'S VERY WORDS.

Case 3:07-cv-00219-RGJ-KLH Document 1-3 Filed 02/06/2007 Page 3 of 7

IN SHORT ONE ONLY HAS TO ALLEGE A SEX OFFENSE IN ALABAMA AND THE COURTS CONVICT, ABSENT DIRECT OR MATERIAL EVIDENCE DUE TO LAWS ILL WRITTEN AND UNDEFINED. THIS GIVES PROSECUTORS UNPRECEDENTED AUTHORITY TO **FLOUT** IN PRESENCE OF GRAND JURORS OR SITTING AT TRIAL. ULTIMATELY, A FAIR TRIAL CANNOT BE SAID TO HAVE TAKEN PLACE BY FEDERAL OR U.S. STANDARDS. U.S.C. 6TH AMENDMENT. THE CHARGES WERE ALLEGED BY A WOMAN WHOM PREVIOUSLY HAD BEEN LIVING WITH THE PETITIONER. THE PETITIONER IS AN HONORABLY DISCHARGED VETERAN OF THE **GULF WAR**, UNMARRIED. ALSO, THE PETITIONER HAD RECEIVED TOTAL DISABILITY STATUS FROM THE VETERANS ADMINISTRATION. FURTHERMORE, THE PETITIONER HAD RECEIVED A LARGE AMOUNT OF MONEY IN BACK PAYMENTS OF DISABILITY AND REGULAR MONTHLY BENEFITS AS WELL. THE PETITIONER AND THE WITNESS PARTED COMPANY.

THE ALLEGED OFFENSE BY THE SECOND PARTY FEMALE WHICH WAS STIPULATED IN COURT BY A SO-CALLED WITNESS, WAS ALSO ANOTHER WOMAN WHOM THE PETITIONER HAD A PREVIOUS BRIEF RELATIONSHIP WITH. BOTH WERE BITTER BECAUSE THE PETITIONER REFUSED TO LET EITHER LIVE WITH HIM. THE SO-CALLED VICTIM'S MOTHER HAD PURPOSED MARRIAGE AND THE PETITIONER DECLINED. THEREBY, THE TWO FEMALES, KNOWING EACH OTHER, CONSPIRED TO GET REVENGE BY USING THE CHILD AS A TERRIBLE WEAPON OF VENGEANCE. A FEW DAYS AFTER SEPARATION OF COMPANY THE PETITIONER STOPPED AT A LOCAL CONVENIENCE STORE TO PURCHASE GAS. THE CLERK WAS A CASUAL ACQUAINTANCE. UPON LEAVING SHE SAID, "MARIO, WATCH YOUR BACK, THERE'RE GOING TO GET EVEN." THE PETITIONER ENTERS THE TRUE FACTS OF HOW THE CHARGE TRANSPIRED. NO PRIOR FELONY RECORD, NO HISTORY OF VIOLENCE, NO HISTORY OF BAD CHARACTER.

MISAPPLICATION OF STATUE-13A-6-61 CR.CODE ALA. (1975)

THE STATE OF ALABAMA, LEE COUNTY, CIRCUIT COURT PROSECUTED AN INNOCENT MAN FOR RAPE 1ST DEGREE, 13A-6-61. THE INVESTIGATION SUPPOSEDLY CONDUCTED CONTAINED ALLEGATIONS OF SEXUAL ABUSE

Case 3:07-cv-00219-RGJ-KLH Document 1-3 Filed 02/06/2007 Page 4 of 7

13A-6-66. THIS IS UNOUESTIONABLE AND APPEARS IN THE TRANSCRIPT. HOWEVER, SEXUAL ABUSE IS A CLASS 'C' FELONY WITH (I YR. 1 DAY-10 YRS.) AVAILABLE IN THE STATUTORY RANGE. THE RAPE 1ST DEGREE CHARGE CARRIES 10 YRS-99 YRS-LIFE. YOUR PETITIONER RECEIVED A 30 YR. SENTENCE FOR RAPE 1ST DEGREE WITH THE STATE FAILING TO PROVE THE ELEMENTS EVEN FOR SEXUAL ABUSE 1ST DEGREE. THE ULTIMATE ISSUE OF RAPE, THUS, PENETRATION BY PENIS WAS ABSENT IN EVIDENCE OF TESTIMONY AND THE DOCTOR'S TESTIMONY. (DR. LISA YOUNG) PROVED THE ISSUE BY COMMENTING ON THE SIZE OF THE HYMEN. THE JURY EXPLICITLY ASKED THE COURT, "WHAT DOES RAPE HAVE AS AN ELEMENT OF PENETRATION?" THE TRIAL JUDGE REPLIED FLATLY, "PENIS, IT HAS TO BE BY PENIS". THE COURT FAILED TO INSTRUCT JURORS PROPERLY ON ELEMENTS MANDATORY FOR THE OFFENSES AFTER HAVING INSTRUCTED THE JURY IN OPEN COURT, THE ELEMENT OF FORCE WAS NOT PRESENT. THE JUDGE FAILED TO INFORM JURORS, IF FORCE IS NOT PRESENT, THE PENETRATION IS NOT POSSIBLE. DEFINING THE OVERT ACTS AND DEFINITIONS OF THE MANDATORY ELEMENTS WAS THE DUTY OF THE TRIAL COURT JUDGE. THE TRIAL COURT JUDGE. ABUSED HIS DISCRETION, BY FAILING TO PROPERLY INSTRUCT JURORS ON ELEMENTS AND OVERT ACTS OF 13A-6-61 AND 13A-6-66, THE ALLEGED CHARGES. PETITIONER ASSERTS, THE INDICTMENT STATES, RAPE 1ST DEGREE ONLY. THE ALLEGED EVIDENCE WAS ABUSE, THE INDICTMENT STATES SEXUAL INTERCOURSE. DR. LISA YOUNG'S TESTIMONY PROVED SEXUAL INTERCOURSE DID NOT HAPPEN BY THE OBVIOUS FACT OF THE PRESENCE OF THE HYMEN. THEREBY, THE STATE OF ALABAMA MISAPPLIED THE STATUE OF 13A-6-61 TO AN INNOCENT MAN.

ARGUMENT

PETITIONER ASSERTS THE TRIAL COURT JUDGE ERRED IN THE ADMISSION OF TESTIMONY ALLEGING ABUSE OF ANOTHER CHILD. THE TESTIMONY WAS GIVEN BY THE WOMAN WHOM PRIOR LIVED WITH THE PETITIONER, (MS. STROZIER), THE MOTHER OF THE ALLEGED VICTIM. THE TESTIMONY WAS PERJURY AND GIVEN FOR THE SOLE PURPOSE OF DESTROYING THE CHARACTER OF THIS PETITIONER, THEREFORE, THE TESTIMONY PREJUDICED

Case 3:07-cv-00219-RGJ-KLH Document 1-3 Filed 02/06/2007 Page 5 of 7

THE RIGHT TO A FAIR AND IMPARTIAL TRIAL. THE 6TH AMENDMENT RIGHTS TO A FAIR TRIAL WERE VIOLATED BY THE TRIAL COURT ALLOWING TESTIMONY OF ONLY 'SPECULATION' AND 'HEARSAY', THEREBY TAINTING THE MINDSET OF THE JURY AND SEVERELY CREATING A SUBSTANTIAL PREJUDICE TO THE PERSONAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO LIFE AND LIBERTY OF THIS PETITIONER. THE ALABAMA CASE LAW, PHILLIPS V. STATE, 505 SO.2D.1075, 1078 SUPPORTS REVERSIBLE ERROR, WHERE THE INADMISSIBLE TESTIMONY SERVES ONLY TO SHOW THE DEFENDANT'S BAD CHARACTER OR TO PREDISPOSITION OF THE SAME ALLEGED OFFENSE CHARGED.

YOUR HONOR, THE PETITIONER ADAMANTLY STATES, THE TRIAL COURT ABUSED ITS DISCRETION IN ALLOWING TESTIMONY OF BRENDA MOSS, SO-CALLED, SELF-PROCLAIMED, (FORENSIC EXAMINER). THE TITLE FORENSIC EXAMINER DEPICTS ONE WITH CERTIFIED 'LEGAL' AND 'EDUCATIONAL' CREDENTIAL. THE INDIVIDUAL NAMED IS THE RECIPIENT OF NEITHER CATEGORY. SHE IS NOT LICENSENED BY THE STATE OF ALABAMA, OR ANY KNOWN MEDICAL FIELD. FAILED TO BE A HOLDER OF COLLEGE DEGREE OR PSYCHOLOGIST OR REMOTELY SOCIAL WORKER STATUS. SHE WAS UNQUALIFIED AND UNPROFESSIONAL AT BEST. THERE EXIST NO CREDENTIALS THAT WOULD PRESENT VAGUE EXPERT STATUS. THE ADMISSION OF TESTIMONY BY BRENDA MOSS WAS <u>DAMNING</u> AND DELIBERATE. ITS RESULTS OF WHICH "TAINTED" THE JURY TO POINT OF "ABORTING" ANY CHANCE OF A FAIR TRIAL AND CONSTITUTES ABUSE OF DISCRETION BY THE TRIAL COURT JUDGE IN THE "WORST" CAPACITY, PREJUDICE! THE TESTIMONY OF BRENDA MOSS WAS NOTHING MORE THAN THEATRICS ORCHESTRATED BY THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY TO TAINT THE JURORS REASONING PROCESS IN LIGHT OF NO DIRECT OR PHYSICAL EVIDENCE EXISTING. THEREBY A LAY PERSON GAVE A PERJURED OPINION WHICH IN REALITY WAS A BALD FACE LIE UPON UTTERANCE. THE U.S. SUPREME COURT RULING OF, THOMPSON V. LOUISVILLE 362 U.S. 199, 4 LED 2D 654, 80 S.CT. 624, BEST DESCRIBES THE LACK OF EVIDENCE IN PETITIONERS CONVICTION, "JUST AS A CONVICTION UPON A CHARGE NOT MADE WOULD SHEER DENIAL OF DUE PROCESS, SO IS IT A VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS TO CONVICT AND PUNISH A MAN WITHOUT EVIDENCE OF HIS

Case 3:07-cv-00219-RGJ-KLH Document 1-3 Filed 02/06/2007 Page 6 of 7

GUILT". THIS YOUR HONOR, IS EXACTLY THE CASE OF A TRULY EXTRAORDINARY CONVICTION BEFORE YOU OF AN INNOCENT AMERICAN, AND HONORABLY DISCHARGED WAR VETERAN AND FATHER. FOR THESE REASONS OF FACT, LAW AND TRUE EVENTS STATED THE PETITIONER ASSERTS THIS COURT SHOULD VACATE CONVICTION AND SENTENCE OF THIRTY YEARS AND TO EXPUNGE THE CRIMINAL CHARGE FROM THE RECORD OF AN HONORABLE MAN SUFFERING FROM A TRUE MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

PETITIONER ADAMANTLY PRAYS THIS COURT TO RECOGNIZE THESE "PLAIN ERRORS" EXISTING IN THE PROCEEDING CASE AND CONSTRUE CONTENTS IN A FAVORABLE LIGHT OF JUSTICE. THEREBY, TO GRANT AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING WHEREBY THIS PETITIONER MAY BE PRESENT WITH "COUNSEL" AND BRING BEFORE THIS COURT A CLASSIC MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE AND FREE AN INNOCENT MAN LANGUISHING IN PRISON FAR FROM HOME. TO ALLOW THE U.S. CONSTITUTION TO RULE IN THE "FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS INTEREST" OF EVIDENCE WILL WITHOUT DOUBT FREE THIS PETITIONER AND RIGHT A WRONG REFLECTION ON THE SYSTEM AMERICANS HOLD DEAR. TO BE ALLOWED THE FAIRNESS OF THIS COURT AND ITS PRINCIPLES OF EQUALITY.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, PETITIONER, "MARIO JIMINEZ", DO CERTIFY THAT ON THIS DATE I HAVE SERVED THE APPROPRIATE PARTIES AND **THE HONORABLE CLERK**, ROBERT H. SHEMWELL OF THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT, WESTERN DISTRICT, AT 300 FANNIN STREET STE. 1167, SHREVEPORT LOUISIANA, 71101-3083.

MARIO JIMINEZ #244571 Maio Ginno 2-2-07

W.C.D.C. B-1 DORM

180 CAPITAL BANK DRIVE

EPPS, LOUISIANA 71237

Case 3:07-cv-00187-MEF-TFM Document 1-3 Filed 02/06/2007

Page 7 of 7

Case 3:07-cv-00219-RGJ-KLH Document 1-3 Filed 02/06/2007

Page 7 of 7

I SWEAR UNDER PENALTY AND PERJURY THAT THIS ABOVE IS TRUE AND CORRECT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, INFORMATION AND BELIEF. SWORN TO BE FOR ME ON THIS DONE DATE

3 DAY OF MONTH JAN 2007.

AT DEATH MY COMMISSION EXPIRES